

Transversally strictly hyperbolic systems

Guy Métivier ^{*} and Tatsuo Nishitani[†]

Abstract

We consider the Cauchy problem for first order systems. Assuming that the set Σ of the singular points of the characteristic variety is a smooth manifold and the characteristic values are real and semi-simple we introduce a new class which is strictly hyperbolic in the transverse direction to Σ . We prove that if Σ is either involutive or symplectic then these transversally strictly hyperbolic systems are strongly hyperbolic. On the other hand if Σ is neither involutive nor symplectic transversally strictly hyperbolic systems are much more involved which is discussed taking an interesting example.

Keywords: Transversally strictly hyperbolic, strongly hyperbolic, uniformly diagonalizable, involutive characteristics, symplectic characteristics, propagation cone

Mathematics Subject Classification 2010: Primary 35L45; Secondary 35F40

1 Introduction

In this note, we continue to study a new class of first order systems

$$(1.1) \quad L(t, x, D_t, D_x) = D_t - \sum_{j=1}^d A_j(t, x) D_{x_j} = D_t - A(t, x, D_x)$$

which we call *transversally strictly hyperbolic systems* in [4] and we discuss whether transversally strictly hyperbolic systems are *strongly hyperbolic*, which means by definition that for all lower order term B the Cauchy problem for $L + B$ with initial data on the surface $\{t = 0\}$ is well-posed in C^∞ . Here we use the notation $D = -i \partial$ for partial derivatives.

^{*}Institut de Mathématiques de Bordeaux, UMR 5251: Guy.Metivier@math.u-bordeaux.fr

[†]Department of Mathematics, Graduate School of Science, Osaka University, Osaka: nishitani@math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp

Assumption 1.1. The coefficient matrices $A_j(t, x)$ are C^∞ and constant outside a compact set and they act on $\mathbb{C}^N$. Moreover, for all (t, x, ξ) the eigenvalues of $A(t, x, \xi) = \sum \xi_j A_j(t, x)$ are real and semi-simple.

We denote by Σ the characteristic variety of L , that is the set of $(t, x, \tau, \xi) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^{1+d} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\det L(t, x, \tau, \xi) = 0$.

Assumption 1.2. Σ is a smooth C^∞ manifold in $T^*\mathbb{R}^{1+d} \setminus \{0\}$ and on each component of Σ the dimension of $\ker L(\rho)$ is constant.

Note that Assumption 1.1 implies that at characteristic points,

$$(1.2) \quad \dim \ker L(t, x, \tau, \xi) = \text{multiplicity of the eigenvalue } \tau.$$

Definition 1.3. Recall first the invariant definition of the *localized system* (or *localization*) L_ρ at $\rho \in \Sigma$:

$$(1.3) \quad L_\rho(\dot{\rho}) = \varpi_\rho(L'(\rho) \cdot \dot{\rho}) \iota_\rho$$

where ι_ρ is the injection of $\ker L(\rho)$ into $\mathbb{C}^N$, ϖ_ρ is the projection from $\mathbb{C}^N$ onto $\mathbb{C}^N / \text{range } L(\rho)$ and L' is the derivative of L . Because $\ker L(\rho) \cap \text{range } L_\rho = \{0\}$ by Assumption 1.1, L_ρ can also be seen as a matrix with values in $\text{Hom}(\ker L(\rho))$. Recall that L_ρ is hyperbolic in the time direction, that is $\det L_\rho$ is a hyperbolic polynomial in the time direction.

We now introduce transversally strictly hyperbolic systems:

Definition 1.4. If for all $\rho \in \Sigma$, $L_\rho(\dot{\rho})$ is strictly hyperbolic in the time direction, on $T^*\mathbb{R}^{d+1}/T_\rho\Sigma$ then we call L a transversally strictly hyperbolic system.

Here we note [4, Proposition 2.2]

Lemma 1.5. *If L is transversally strictly hyperbolic then L is uniformly symmetrizable (equivalently uniformly diagonalizable), that is there is a family of hermitian symmetric matrices $S(t, x, \xi)$, such that S and S^{-1} are uniformly bounded and SA is symmetric.*

Theorem 1.6 ([3]). *If there is a symmetrizer which is Lipschitz continuous in $(t, x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times S^{d-1}$ then the Cauchy problem for L is L^2 well-posed and hence L is a strongly hyperbolic system.*

The symmetrizer can not be chosen to be Lipschitz continuous, not even continuous in general ([3]). We discuss about this later. We say that $f(x) \in \gamma^{(s)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the Gevrey class of order s , if for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist $C > 0, A > 0$ such that we have

$$|D^\alpha f(x)| \leq CA^{|\alpha|} |\alpha|!^s, \quad x \in K, \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d.$$

We denote $\gamma_0^{(s)}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \gamma^{(s)}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Theorem 1.7 ([6]). *Assume that $L(t, x, \tau, \xi)$ is uniformly symmetrizable then the Cauchy problem for $L+B$ is well-posed in the Gevrey class of order $1 < s \leq 2$ for any B .*

A simple proof of the result is found in [1].

Theorem 1.8 ([4]). *Assume that Σ is an involutive submanifold of $T^*\mathbb{R}^{1+d} \setminus \{0\}$ and L is transversally strictly hyperbolic. Then the Cauchy problem for L with initial data on $\{t = 0\}$ is well-posed in L^2 . In particular L is a strongly hyperbolic system.*

Theorem 1.9. *Assume that Σ is a symplectic submanifold of $T^*\mathbb{R}^{1+d} \setminus \{0\}$ and L is transversally strictly hyperbolic. Then the Cauchy problem for $L+B$ with initial data on $\{t = 0\}$ is C^∞ well-posed for any $B(t, x)$, that is L is a strongly hyperbolic system.*

Sketch of the proof: Writing $L(t, x, \tau, \xi) + B(t, x) = \tau I_N - A(t, x, \xi) + B(t, x)$ one can assume that $A(t, x, \xi) - B(t, x)$ is block diagonal. Thus we can assume that A is a $r \times r$ matrix and $h(t, x, \tau, \xi) = \det L(t, x, \tau, \xi)$ vanishes of order r on a symplectic manifold Σ . Denote by $M(t, x, \tau, \xi)$ the cofactor matrix of the symbol $L(t, x, \tau, \xi)$. We look for a solution to $(L+B)U = 0$ in the form $U = M(t, x, D_t, D_x)u$ so that we are led to consider the Cauchy problem

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} (L(t, x, D_t, D_x) + B(t, x))M(t, x, D_t, D_x)u = 0, \\ D_t^j u(0, x) = u_j(x), \quad j = 0, \dots, r-1. \end{cases}$$

With $\mathcal{P}(t, x, D_t, D_x) = (L(t, x, D_t, D_x) + B(t, x))M(t, x, D_t, D_x)$ one has

Lemma 1.10. *Denoting $h(t, x, \tau, \xi) = \det L(t, x, \tau, \xi)$ we have*

$$\mathcal{P}(t, x, \tau, \xi) = h(t, x, \tau, \xi)I_r + P_{r-1} + \dots + P_0$$

where $P_j(t, x, \tau, \xi)$ are homogeneous of degree j in (τ, ξ) and vanishes of order $r - 2j$ on Σ .

Proof. We may assume that Σ is given by (microlocally) $\phi_0 = \tau = 0, \phi_1(t, x, \xi) = 0, \dots, \phi_k(t, x, \xi) = 0$. Then from the assumption one can write

$$L(t, x, \tau, \xi) = \phi_0 I_r + \sum_{j=1}^k \underline{A}_j(t, x, \xi) \phi_j(t, x, \xi)$$

and hence $M(t, x, \tau, \xi)$ is a homogeneous polynomial in $(\phi_0, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_k)$ of degree $r - 1$. Since

$$P_{r-j}(t, x, \tau, \xi) = \sum_{l+|\alpha|=j} (-i)^j \partial_t^l \partial_x^\alpha (L(t, x, \tau, \xi) + B(t, x)) \partial_\tau^l \partial_\xi^\alpha M(t, x, \tau, \xi)$$

and $\partial_\tau^l \partial_\xi^\alpha M(t, x, \tau, \xi)$ vanishes on Σ of order $r - 1 - l - |\alpha|$ then the assertion is clear because $r - 2j \leq r - 1 - j$ for $j \geq 1$. $\square$

Then the solvability of the Cauchy problem follows from [7, Theorem 1.3].

2 Neither involutive nor symplectic case

If Σ is neither involutive nor symplectic, we will see that transversally strictly hyperbolic systems are more involved. We make detailed study on the following 3×3 system

$$\begin{aligned} L_a &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + x \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & 1 \\ -a & 0 & 0 \\ 1+a^2 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + A \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + xB \frac{\partial}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + G_a \end{aligned}$$

where $a \in \mathbb{C}$ which is given in [3]. Note that

$$\det L_a(x, \tau, \xi, \eta) = \tau(\tau^2 - \xi^2 - x^2 \eta^2)$$

and the characteristic manifold is $\Sigma = \{\tau = 0, \xi = 0, x = 0\}$ which is neither symplectic nor involutive. Let $\rho = (\bar{t}, 0, \bar{y}, 0, 0, \bar{\eta}) \in \Sigma$ where $\bar{\eta} \neq 0$. Since

$$(L_a)_\rho(\dot{x}, \dot{\tau}, \dot{\xi}) = \dot{\tau} I + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \dot{\xi} + \bar{\eta} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & 1 \\ -a & 0 & 0 \\ 1+a^2 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \dot{x}$$

then $\det(L_a)_\rho(\dot{x}, \dot{\tau}, \dot{\xi}) = \dot{\tau}(\dot{\tau}^2 - \dot{\xi}^2 - \bar{\eta}^2 \dot{x}^2)$ is a strictly hyperbolic polynomial in $(\dot{x}, \dot{\tau}, \dot{\xi})$. Therefore L_a is transversally strictly hyperbolic system for any $a \in \mathbb{C}$ by definition with characteristic manifold Σ which is neither symplectic nor involutive.

2.1 Ill-posedness

Note

$$L_a^* = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t} - A^* \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - xB^* \frac{\partial}{\partial y} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + G_a^*$$

and consider the eigenvalue problem $G_a^* V(x, y) = i\beta V(x, y)$. We look for $V(x, y)$ in the form $V = e^{\pm iy} \bar{V}^\pm(x)$ so that the problem is reduced to $(A^* \partial_x \pm ix B^*) \bar{V}^\pm(x) = -i\beta \bar{V}^\pm(x)$. Denote

$$\bar{V}^\pm(x) = \begin{pmatrix} u^\pm(x) \\ v^\pm(x) \\ w^\pm(x) \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $u^\pm(x)$ satisfies

$$(2.1) \quad (\partial_x^2 - x^2 + \beta^2 \pm i\bar{a})u^\pm(x) = 0$$

then with

$$\begin{aligned} v^\pm(x) &= \frac{i}{\beta}(\partial_x \pm i\bar{a}x)u^\pm(x), \\ w^\pm(x) &= \mp \frac{x}{\beta}u^\pm(x) \end{aligned}$$

we conclude that $G_a^* V^\pm = i\beta V^\pm$. Since $G_a^* V^\pm(\eta x, \eta^2 y) = i\eta\beta V^\pm(\eta x, \eta^2 y)$ one has

$$L_a^*(e^{i\beta\eta t} V^\pm(\eta x, \eta^2 y)) = 0.$$

The following lemma is easily checked.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that $ia \notin [-1, 1]$. Then either $\beta^2 + i\bar{a} = 1$ or $\beta^2 - i\bar{a} = 1$ has a root $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\text{Im } \beta > 0$.*

Assume that $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ is chosen such that $\beta^2 \pm i\bar{a} = 1$ so that (2.1) is verified by $u^\pm(x) = e^{-x^2/2}$. Therefore

$$W^\pm(t, x, y) = \exp\left(i\beta\eta t \pm iy\eta^2 - \frac{1}{2}\eta^2 x^2\right)(W_0 + \eta x W_1)$$

solves $L_a^* W^\pm = 0$ where

$$W_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad W_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -i(1 \mp i\bar{a})/\beta \\ \mp 1/\beta \end{pmatrix}.$$

We now consider the following Cauchy problem

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} L_a U = 0, \\ U(0, x, y) = \phi(x)\psi(y)W_0 \end{cases}$$

where $\phi, \psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ are real valued. We remark that we can assume that solutions U to (2.2) have compact supports with respect to (x, y) . To examine this we recall the Holmgren uniqueness theorem (see for example [5, Theorem 4.2]). For $\delta > 0$ we denote

$$D_\delta = \{(t, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x^2 + y^2 + |t| < \delta\}$$

then we have

Proposition 2.2 (Holmgren). *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $U(t, x, y) \in C^1(D_\delta)$ with $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ verifies*

$$\begin{cases} L_a U = 0 & \text{in } D_\delta, \\ U(0, x, y) = 0 & \text{on } (x, y) \in D_\delta \cap \{t = 0\} \end{cases}$$

then $U(t, x, y)$ vanishes identically in D_δ .

Proposition 2.3. *Assume that $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is an even function such that $\psi \notin \gamma_0^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$. We assume also $\phi(0) \neq 0$. Let Ω be a neighborhood of the origin of $\mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\text{supp } \phi\psi \subset \Omega \cap \{t = 0\}$. Then the Cauchy problem (2.2) has no $C^1(\Omega)$ solution.*

Proof. Suppose that there is a neighborhood Ω of the origin verifying $\text{supp } \phi\psi \subset \Omega \cap \{t = 0\}$ such that the Cauchy problem would have $C^1(\Omega)$ solution U . From Proposition 2.2 one can assume $U(t, x, y) = 0$ for $x^2 + y^2 \geq r^2$ if $|t| \leq T$ with some small $T > 0$ and $r > 0$. Denote

$$W_\eta^\pm(t, x, y) = e^{\pm i\eta^2 y - i\beta\eta(T-t)} e^{-\eta^2 x^2/2}$$

then we have $L_a^* W_\eta^\pm = 0$. From

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_0^T (L_a^* W_\eta^\pm, U) dt = \int_0^T (W_\eta^\pm, L_a U) dt \\ &\quad + (W_\eta^\pm(T), U(T)) - (W_\eta^\pm(0), U(0)) \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$(2.3) \quad (W_\eta^\pm(T), U(T)) = (W_\eta^\pm(0), U(0)).$$

Note that the left-hand side on (2.3) is $O(\eta)$ as $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ while the right-hand side is

$$(2.4) \quad \eta^{-1} e^{-i\beta\eta T} \hat{\psi}(\eta^2) \int e^{-x^2/2} \phi(\eta^{-1}x) dx$$

where $\hat{\psi}$ denotes the Fourier transform of ψ . Then from (2.4) we conclude that there is $C > 0$ such that for large positive η one has

$$|\hat{\psi}(\eta^2)| \leq C\eta^2 e^{(-\operatorname{Im}\beta)\eta T}.$$

Since ψ is even this implies that $|\hat{\psi}(\eta)| \leq C' e^{-c|\eta|^{1/2}}$ with some $c > 0$ and hence $\psi \in \gamma_0^{(2)}(\mathbb{R})$ which is a contradiction. $\square$

Theorem 2.4. *Assume that $ia \notin [-1, 1]$. Then the Cauchy problem for L_a is not locally solvable in the Gevrey class of order $s > 2$.*

Corollary 2.5. *Assume that $ia \notin [-1, 1]$. Then the Cauchy problem for L_a is C^∞ ill-posed.*

2.2 Well-posedness

Recall

$$(2.5) \quad L_a = \partial_t + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \partial_x + ax\partial_y & x\partial_y \\ \partial_x - ax\partial_y & 0 & 0 \\ (1+a^2)x\partial_y & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \partial_t + G_a.$$

Lemma 2.6 ([3]). *If $a \neq 0$ is a constant, there are bounded symmetrizers $S(x, \xi, \eta)$ for L_a , but no continuous symmetrizers at $(x, \xi) = (0, 0)$ when $\eta = 1$.*

The equation $L_a U = F$ reads

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t u + (\partial_x + ax\partial_y)v + x\partial_y w &= f \\ \partial_t v + (\partial_x - ax\partial_y)u &= g \\ \partial_t w + (1+a^2)x\partial_y u &= h \end{aligned}$$

where $U = {}^t(u, v, w)$ and $F = {}^t(f, g, h)$. Thus

$$(2.7) \quad Pu = \partial_t f - (\partial_x + ax\partial_y)g - x\partial_y h$$

where

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} P &= \partial_t^2 - (\partial_x + ax\partial_y)(\partial_x - ax\partial_y) - (1+a^2)x^2\partial_y^2 \\ &= \partial_t^2 - \partial_x^2 - x^2\partial_y^2 + a\partial_y. \end{aligned}$$

We choose $a = i\mu$ with $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and denote

$$A = -\partial_x^2 - x^2\partial_y^2 + i\mu\partial_y$$

so that $P = \partial_t^2 + A$ where A is self adjoint and positive if $|\mu| < 1$:

Lemma 2.7. *We have $(Au, u) = (u, Au)$ for $u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. For $|\mu| < 1$ we have*

$$(Au, u) \geq (1 - |\mu|)(\|\partial_x u\|^2 + \|x\partial_y u\|^2), \quad u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

Proof. The first assertion is clear. Note that

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} |(\partial_y u, u)| &= |([\partial_x, x\partial_y]u, u)| \leq 2\|\partial_x u\|\|x\partial_y u\| \\ &\leq \|\partial_x u\|^2 + \|x\partial_y u\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(Au, u) = \|\partial_x u\|^2 + \|x\partial_y u\|^2 + (i\mu x\partial_y u, u)$ and

$$|(i\mu x\partial_y u, u)| \leq |\mu| |(\partial_y u, u)| \leq |\mu|(\|\partial_x u\|^2 + \|x\partial_y u\|^2)$$

by (2.9) the proof is clear. $\square$

Assume that f, g, h in (2.6) are linear combinations of u, v, w with coefficients which are C^∞ and constant outside a compact set. Then in

$$\partial_t f - (\partial_x + ax\partial_y)g - x\partial_y h$$

replacing $\partial_t v$ and $\partial_t w$ by the second and third equations of (2.6) one can write

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t^2 u + Au &= c\partial_t u + b_1 u + b_2 v + b_3 w + \tilde{f} \\ \partial_t v + (\partial_x - a\partial_y)u &= \tilde{g} \\ \partial_t w + ax\partial_y u &= \tilde{h} \end{aligned}$$

where $b_j = b_{j1}(t, x, y)\partial_x + b_{j2}(t, x, y)x\partial_y$ and $c(t, x, y), b_{ji}(t, x, y)$ are C^∞ and constant outside a compact set and

$$(2.11) \quad |\tilde{f}| + |\tilde{g}| + |\tilde{h}| \lesssim |u| + |v| + |w|.$$

Taking this into account we consider

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t^2 u + Au &= B_0 u + B_1 \partial_t u + Bv \\ \partial_t v &= Cu \end{aligned}$$

where we assume

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \|Cu\|^2 &\lesssim (Au, u), \quad \|B^*u\|^2 \lesssim (Au, u), \quad \|(\partial_t B)^*u\|^2 \lesssim (Au, u) \\ \|B_0u\|^2 &\lesssim (Au, u), \quad \|B_1u\| \lesssim \|u\|. \end{aligned}$$

Introduce the energy

$$\mathcal{E}(t) = \frac{1}{2}(\|\partial_t u(t)\|^2 + (Au, u) + \lambda^2\|u(t)\|^2 + \lambda^2\|v(t)\|^2)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a positive constant. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathcal{E}(t) &= \operatorname{Re}(Bv, \partial_t u) + \operatorname{Re}(B_0u + B_1\partial_t u, \partial_t u) \\ &\quad + \lambda^2 \operatorname{Re}(\partial_t u, u) + \lambda^2 \operatorname{Re}(Cu, v). \end{aligned}$$

The last two terms are $O(\mathcal{E}(t))$, thus

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \lesssim \mathcal{E}(0) + \operatorname{Re} \int_0^t (Bv, \partial_t u) dt' + \int_0^t \mathcal{E}(t') dt'.$$

Integrating by parts in time, then from (2.13) the first integral is

$$-\operatorname{Re} \int_0^t ((\partial_t v, B^*u) + (v, (\partial_t B)^*u)) dt' + \operatorname{Re}(v, B^*u) \Big|_0^t.$$

Thanks to (2.13) one has

$$-\operatorname{Re} \int_0^t ((Cu, B^*u) + (v, (\partial_t B)^*u)) dt' \lesssim \int_0^t \mathcal{E}(t') dt'$$

and the boundary term at t is

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re}(v(t), B^*u(t)) &\lesssim (Au(t), u(t))^{1/2} \|v(t)\| \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{E}(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\|v(0)\| + \int_0^t \mathcal{E}(t')^{\frac{1}{2}} dt' \right) \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon \mathcal{E}(t) + C_\varepsilon \left(\|v(0)\|^2 + t \int_0^t \mathcal{E}(t') dt' \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\operatorname{Re}(v(0), (B^*u)(0)) \lesssim \mathcal{E}(0)$ by (2.13) again choosing ε small enough, we get

Lemma 2.8. *Assume $|\mu| < 1$. Then we have*

$$(2.14) \quad \mathcal{E}(t) \lesssim \mathcal{E}(0) + (1+t) \int_0^t \mathcal{E}(t') dt'.$$

For any given $B = B(t, x, y)$ which is C^∞ and constant outside a compact set we consider the Cauchy problem

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{aligned} L_a U &= BU, \\ U(0, x, y) &= U_0(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.9. *Assume $|\mu| < 1$. For any $T > 0$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $U \in C^1([0, T]; H^{p+1}(\mathbb{R}^2))$ supported in $x^2 + y^2 \leq R^2$ and satisfying (2.15) we have*

$$(2.16) \quad \|U(t)\|_p \leq C\|U_0\|_{p+1}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Proof. We denote

$$\mathcal{E}(t) = \frac{1}{2}(\|\partial_t u(t)\|^2 + (Au, u) + \lambda^2\|u(t)\|^2 + \lambda^2\|v(t)\|^2 + \lambda^2\|w(t)\|^2).$$

If $U = {}^t(u, v, w)$ satisfies (2.15) then u, v, w verifies (2.10) which is a bounded perturbation of a system of the form (2.12) with (v, w) in place of v for the second equation of (2.12). Therefore from Lemma 2.8 we have

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \lesssim \mathcal{E}(0) + (1+t) \int_0^t \mathcal{E}(t') dt'.$$

From Gronwall's lemma for any $T > 0$ there is $C > 0$ such that $\mathcal{E}(t) \leq C\mathcal{E}(0)$ for $0 \leq t \leq T$. This shows that

$$(2.17) \quad \|U(t)\| \leq C(\|\partial_t U(0)\| + \|\partial_x U(0)\| + \|x\partial_y U(0)\| + \|U(0)\|).$$

From the equation $\partial_t U(0)$ can be estimated by $C(\|\partial_x U_0\| + \|x\partial_y U_0\| + \|U_0\|)$ then (2.17) proves (2.16) when $p = 0$. Then applying $\partial_x^k \partial_y^\ell$ to (2.15) and repeating the same arguments we obtain (2.16) for general $p \in \mathbb{N}$. $\square$

Theorem 2.10. *If $ia \in (-1, 1)$ then L_a is strongly hyperbolic.*

Proof. Approximate $B(t, x, y)$ and $U_0(x, y) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by Gevrey functions B^ε and U_0^ε for which the Cauchy problem

$$L_a U = B^\varepsilon U, \quad U(0, x, y) = U_0^\varepsilon(x, y).$$

admits a unique solution $U^\varepsilon \in C^1([0, T]; C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))$. From Lemma 2.9 we see that $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|U^\varepsilon(t)\|_p$ is uniformly bounded in ε . From Ascoli-Arzelà's theorem one can pick a uniformly convergent subsequence of $\{U^\varepsilon\}$ such that their derivatives also uniformly convergent. Then the limit function U solves the Cauchy problem (2.15). $\square$

From Lemma 2.6 there is no symmetrizer of G_a which is continuous at $(x, \xi, \eta) = (0, 0, 1)$ if $a \neq 0$ while one can construct a smooth symmetrizer of *second order* if $ia \in (-1, 1)$. Set $a = i\mu$ with $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. We denote

$$(2.18) \quad S = \begin{pmatrix} A + \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B + \lambda & D \\ 0 & D^* & C + \lambda \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \partial_x - i\mu x \partial_y, & Y &= x \partial_y, \\ A &= X^* X + (1 - \mu^2) Y^* Y \\ B &= X X^*, & C &= Y Y^* = Y^* Y, & D &= X Y^* \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a positive constant. Note that

$$(2.19) \quad \begin{aligned} (SU, U) &= \|Xu\|^2 + (1 - \mu^2) \|Yu\|^2 \\ &\quad + \|X^*v + Yw\|^2 + \lambda(\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 + \|w\|^2) \end{aligned}$$

with $U = {}^t(u, v, w)$.

Lemma 2.11. *For $|\mu| < 1$, one has*

$$(2.20) \quad \|Xu\|^2 + \|Yu\|^2 + \lambda\|U\|^2 \leq (SU, U), \quad U = {}^t(u, v, w).$$

Moreover

$$(2.21) \quad \operatorname{Re}(SG_a U, U) \leq (SU, U).$$

Proof. The first estimate follows immediately from (2.19). Next we compute

$$\begin{aligned} SG_a &= \begin{pmatrix} A + \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B + \lambda & D \\ 0 & D^* & C + \lambda \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -X^* & -Y^* \\ X & 0 & 0 \\ (1 - \mu^2)Y & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -(A + \lambda)X^* & -(A + \lambda)Y^* \\ (B + \lambda)X + (1 - \mu^2)DY & 0 & 0 \\ D^*X + (1 - \mu^2)(C + \lambda)Y & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

where we note that

$$\begin{aligned} BX + (1 - \mu^2)DY &= XX^*X + (1 - \mu^2)XY^*Y = XA = XA^*, \\ D^*X + (1 - \mu^2)CY &= YX^*X + (1 - \mu^2)YY^*Y = YA = YA^*. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore one has

$$\operatorname{Re} SG_a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\mu^2 \lambda Y^* \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\mu^2 \lambda Y & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and (2.21) follows from (2.20) and $|\mu| < 1$. $\square$

Thanks to Lemma 2.11 we have

$$(2.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \partial_t (SU, U) &= -\operatorname{Re} (SG_a U, U) + \operatorname{Re} (SL_a U, U) \\ &\leq (SU, U) + |(SL_a U, U)|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|(SL_a U, U)| \leq (SL_a U, L_a U)^{1/2} (SU, U)^{1/2}$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} (SU(t), U(t))^{1/2} &\leq e^t (SU(0), U(0))^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{t-s} (SL_a U(s), L_a U(s))^{1/2} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Then denoting

$$[[U]]_1^2 = \|U\|^2 + \|\partial_x U\|^2 + \|x \partial_y U\|^2$$

there is $C > 0$ such that

$$\|U(t)\| \leq C \left(e^t [[U(0)]]_1 + \int_0^t e^{t-s} [[L_a U(s)]]_1(s) ds \right).$$

3 Remarks

It seems to be natural to state Theorems 1.8 and 1.9 in terms of the propagation cone of L_ρ . Consider L_ρ on $T^*\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ not on $T^*\mathbb{R}^{d+1}/T_\rho\Sigma$ and hence L_ρ is independent of directions in $T_\rho\Sigma$. Note that

$$\det L_\rho(t, x, \tau, \xi) = h_\rho(t, x, \tau, \xi), \quad h = \det L$$

where h_ρ is the first non-vanishing term of the Taylor expansion of $h(t, x, \tau, \xi)$ around ρ which is a homogeneous polynomial in (t, x, τ, ξ) . Recall the hyperbolicity cone $\Gamma(L_\rho)$ of L_ρ defined as the connected component of $\theta = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) = -H_t$ in

$$\{(t, x, \tau, \xi) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \mid \det L_\rho(t, x, \tau, \xi) \neq 0\}.$$

The propagation cone $C(L_\rho)$ of L_ρ is given by

$$C(L_\rho) = \{X = (t, x, \tau, \xi) \mid \sigma(X, Y) \leq 0, \forall Y \in \Gamma(L_\rho)\}$$

where $\sigma = \sum_{j=0}^d d\xi_j \wedge dx_j$ with $x_0 = t$ and $\xi_0 = \tau$ is the symplectic two form on $T^*\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. The propagation cone is the *minimal* cone including every bicharacteristic of h which has ρ as a limit point in the following sense:

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\rho \in T^*\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a multiple characteristic of h . Assume that there are simple characteristics ρ_j of h and positive numbers γ_j such that*

$$\rho_j \rightarrow \rho \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_j H_h(\rho_j) \rightarrow X (\neq 0) \quad j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then $X \in C(L_\rho)$. Here H_h denotes the Hamilton vector field of h .

Denote $\{X \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \mid (d\xi \wedge dx)(X, Y) = 0, \forall Y \in T_\rho \Sigma\}$ by $(T_\rho \Sigma)^\sigma$, the σ orthogonal space of $T_\rho \Sigma$. Since L_ρ is independent of directions in $T_\rho \Sigma$ it is clear that $C(L_\rho) \subset (T_\rho \Sigma)^\sigma$. Here we note

Lemma 3.2 ([8]). *The characteristic manifold Σ is an involutive manifold if and only if $C(L_\rho) \subset T_\rho \Sigma$ for all $\rho \in \Sigma$.*

Thus Theorem 1.8 is stated as

Theorem 3.3. *Assume that $C(L_\rho) \subset T_\rho \Sigma$ for all $\rho \in \Sigma$ and L is transversally strictly hyperbolic. Then the Cauchy problem for $L + B$ with initial data on $\{t = 0\}$ is C^∞ well-posed for any $B(t, x)$, that is L is a strongly hyperbolic system.*

If Σ is a symplectic manifold, that is $T_\rho \Sigma \cap (T_\rho \Sigma)^\sigma = \{0\}$ then it is clear that $C(L_\rho) \cap T_\rho \Sigma = \{0\}$ because $C(L_\rho) \subset (T_\rho \Sigma)^\sigma$. Actually Theorem 1.9 could be generalized to

Theorem 3.4. *Assume that $C(L_\rho) \cap T_\rho \Sigma = \{0\}$ for all $\rho \in \Sigma$ and L is transversally strictly hyperbolic. Then the Cauchy problem for $L + B$ with initial data on $\{t = 0\}$ is C^∞ well-posed for any $B(t, x)$, that is L is a strongly hyperbolic system.*

For L_a which we have studied in Section 2 we see $C((L_a)_\rho)$ is independent of $a \in \mathbb{C}$ because $\det(L_a)_\rho(\dot{x}, \dot{\tau}, \dot{\xi}) = (\det L_a)_\rho(\dot{x}, \dot{\tau}, \dot{\xi}) = \dot{\tau}(\dot{\tau}^2 - \dot{\xi}^2 - \bar{\eta}^2 \dot{x}^2)$. It is also easy to check that

$$\{0\} \neq C((L_a)_\rho) \cap T_\rho \Sigma \subsetneq C((L_a)_\rho)$$

while L_a is strongly hyperbolic system if $ia \in (-1, 1)$ and not if $ia \notin [-1, 1]$.

References

- [1] F.Colombini, T.Nishitani and J.Rauch, Weakly hyperbolic systems by symmetrization.
- [2] V.Ivrii and V.Petkov, Necessary conditions for the Cauchy problem for non strictly hyperbolic equations to be well posed. *Uspehi Mat. Nauk*, **29** (1974) 3–70.
- [3] G.Métivier, L^2 well posed Cauchy problems and symmetrizability, *J. Ecole Polytechnique*, **1** (2014) 39–70.
- [4] G.Métivier and T.Nishitani, Note on strongly hyperbolic systems with involutive characteristics, to appear in *Kyoto J. Math.*
- [5] S.Mizohata, The theory of partial differential equations, Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- [6] K.Kajitani, The Cauchy problem for uniformly diagonalizable hyperbolic systems in Gevrey classes. In: *Hyperbolic Equations and Related Topics*, 101-123, Academic Press, Boston, MA, 1986.
- [7] T.Nishitani, Hyperbolic operators with symplectic multiple characteristics, *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, **29** (1989) 405–447.
- [8] T.Nishitani, Necessary conditions for strong hyperbolicity of first order systems, *J. Anal. Math.*, **61** (1993) 181–229.